

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

IN THE ABSTRACT:

Please cancel the abstract that should have been sent and substitute therefor the new abstract enclosed herewith in duplicate. A substitute page containing the amended abstract is enclosed herewith.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

Please cancel the summary of the invention and substitute therefor the new summary enclosed herewith. Substitute pages containing the amendments are enclosed herewith.

DRAWINGS

Please delete that portion of the specification at the bottom of page 2 and labeled "Drawings" and substitute a new section labeled "Brief Description with Reference to the Drawings". A substitute sheet containing this change is enclosed herewith.

REMARKS

Your "Detailed Action" points out many failings of my application's written structure, for example there is no Abstract. It was my belief that my patent application was forwarded to your office from WIPO/PCT and the application had an Abstract when I applied so I do not know why your office

never got a complete copy of my application. That aside, I have made the changes as you requested.

Please note that besides applying to the United States in the National Phase of my application, I also applied to Canada and the United Kingdom.

I would like to inform you that the Canadian Office identified two previous US Patents that are similar to my application and they are Johnson (3,042,409) and Williams (2,898,101) and WIPO/PCT and the UK also identified Pelz (3,549,300). It would appear that no inventive subject matter was disclosed by my application when comparing my application with these patents as indicated by these offices. I am currently amending my application for these offices too.

I have to disagree with the above observations. If you put Johnson, Pelz, and Applicant's putters together as in the diagram I provided you will see that you end up with three distinctly different putters even though they use a similar system of alignment (but not the same). If the putters are completely different then the alignment systems must be different. This observation would be evident to anyone skilled in the technology. It would also be impossible to build the

same putter using these different aligning systems and if that is true then these systems are all unique and inventive.

If one looks at these putters individually you will see the vast differences even though they all use a shaft to head alignment system. The differences are as follows:

Johnson - uses a conventional facing putter, which in turn moves the putter further away from the person using it. The shaft and not just a mark/s on the shaft is used for alignment to the center of the putter. This system is only for putters

Pelz - uses a multitude of lines on the shaft to a mark on the heel portion of the club head as opposed to the center of the club head AKA Johnson. The club head is backward or closer to the golfer unlike Johnson. Pelz claims this system can be applied to irons and woods because the user aligns his/her body to the club and not the eyes to the club. This is an immense difference in alignment when it comes to golf and putting.

Applicant - uses a backward putter AKA Pelz but that is where it ends. Applicant aligns only one mark on the shaft and not a multitude of marks on the shaft, as does Pelz. Applicant aligns shaft mark to the centerline of the putter head and not one near

5

shaft mark to the centerline of the putter head and not one near the heel of the club as in Pelz. Applicant's putter shaft crosses the centerline of the putter head whereas Johnson's does not. This alignment system is for putters only.

You can not apply Applicant's or Johnson's alignment systems to irons or woods as Pelz does with his system, because the golfer could never get their eyes over these club heads as they would be standing too far away from the club head.

The position of the golf ball AKA Johnson and Applicant is directly under the golfer's eyes and at the center of the putter face when they use their system where in Pelz their eyes are behind the ball and not directly over it. This is a substantial difference from having a golfer line their eye directly over a putter/ball when putting.

In essence, what you have is three completely different alignment systems using a shaft to putter head alignment creating 3 completely different putters. These three alignment systems are not interchangeable thereby making them distinct and innovative. If these three alignment systems are the same then the putters built using these systems should all be the same but when you compare each putters specification ^{then} it is apparent

that they are different. It should be also noted that in golf the slightest difference in stance alignment in putting could cause a huge variation in putting results. A person holding these three putters in the putting position would be at three different body/eye positions relative to the putter head and ball, thereby making them putt in a different way. Because of this, I believe that my system innovative and an improvement over the other two.

In addition, Pelz discloses a putter having a putter head with a shaft affixed near the toe and bent back over the heel of the putter head. A mark is provided on the top of the putter head near the heel and a plurality of spaced apart marks provided on the top of the shaft. A golfer lines up a line on the shaft with the mark on the top of the putter in order to consistently position himself with respect to the ball. However, alignment in Pelz is with respect to the mark on the top of the putter head, which is offset from the ball. This prevents Pelz from simultaneously lining up the direction of the putt with the center of the striking plate and hence the ball. In Applicant's putter the alignment mark on the putter head is at the center of the striking plate. Accordingly, alignment in Applicant's putter is to the center of the striking plate and simultaneously with the intended direction of the putt. Thus,

Applicant provides a much more accurate alignment than does Pelz. These distinctions are illustrated in the following diagrams.

Johnson discloses a putter with a shaft having a V-shaped notch wherein the tip of the V constitutes one sighting guide while a mark on the top surface of the putter head at the center thereof constitutes the second sighting guide. The putting shaft is attached to the heel of the club unlike Applicant in which the shaft is attached near the toe of the putting head. Consequently, the contribution of the shaft to the overall center of gravity of the putter moves the center of gravity towards the heel. In Applicant, there is no shift in the overall center of gravity of the putter due to the shaft because part of it is on one side of the mark on the top of the putter head and part on the other side. Alignment of the overall center of gravity of the putter with the center of the striking plate provides a much more positive strike to the ball.

Similar distinctions apply to Williams as apply to Johnson. However, Williams further requires a mirror assembly to be attached to the shaft of the putter.

8

Claim 1 as revised claims a putter with a shaft whose center of gravity is vertically aligned with the center of gravity of the putter head. None of the three references cited shows this feature. Such alignment as previously stated results in a much more positive striking of the ball than putters in which not such alignment is present.


No new material has been added.

Favourable re-consideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted

Date: October 6, 2003

By:


Gary R. Lister

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 09 2003

OFFICIAL

I CLAIM1. A golf putter, comprising:

(a) a putter head having a striking face, a sole, a center line marker marking a center of gravity of said putter head, a toe normally positioned remote from a user when in play and a heel opposite said toe;

(b) an elongated putter shaft having a grip on one end and, at an opposite end, attached to said putter head between the center line marker and said toe, said putter shaft having a transverse marking which lines up vertically with the center line marker on said putter head when a user is holding said putter in a putting position with the golfer's eyes over said center line marker of said putter head.

2. The golf putter according to claim 1, wherein the center line marker is perpendicular to the striking face and is vertically aligned with the center of gravity of said putter head.

3. The golf putter according to claim 1, wherein said putter shaft extends across said putter head from proximate said toe towards said heel at an acute angle with the sole of

said putter head, crossing the center line of said putter head.

4. The golf putter according to claim 1, wherein the transverse marking on said shaft marks the center of gravity of said shaft when said putter is in the putting position.
5. The golf putter according to claim 3, wherein said putter shaft extends up from said putter head vertically, when said putter is in the putting position and then angles toward the golfer.
6. A method of aligning a putter and a golfer's eyes to a golf ball and a desired line of travel, comprising:
 - (a) providing a putter which has a shaft attached proximate a toe of a putter head and at least a portion of which shaft angles back towards a golfer when said golfer and said shaft are in the putting position;
 - (b) placing a center line marker over a center of gravity of the putter head;
 - (c) placing a marker on an upper side of the shaft of said putter which vertically aligns with the center

line marker when said putter is in the putting position; and

- (d) holding said putter in the putting position and then aligning a golfer's eyes with the aligned mark on said shaft and said center line mark on the putter head such that the putter head is perpendicular to the desired direction of travel of the golf ball.

~~The embodiment of the invention in which an exclusive property or privilege is claimed are defined as follows:~~

- ~~1. A golf putting alignment system where a putter comprises:
an elongated club shaft having a grip on one end and
the other end is attached to a putter head at a
junction between the centerline mark and the toe,

the putter head points towards the golfer making it
easier for the golfer to get his/her eyes over the
putter and ball as opposed to a conventional putter
where the putter head points away from the golfer.

the said putter head having a striking face and having
a heel and a toe on the opposite sides of said
junction,

the said putter head also has a back, top and sole.~~

~~2. The head has a centerline mark running the width of it and perpendicular to the face and is positioned at the desired area of putter to ball contact.~~

~~3. The said shaft is attached at an acute angle to the heel position and extends directly over the length of putter head in direction away from the toe and parallel to the face.~~

~~4. Attaching the shaft in this position causes the shaft to extend back over putter head, thus crossing the centerline mark on the head.~~

~~5. An alignment mark is placed on the top of the shaft directly over the position the shaft crosses the centerline mark.~~

~~6. The putting system using an alignment mark on the top of a shaft in relation to the center line mark on the putter head~~

~~7. When the alignment mark on the top of the shaft is aligned to the centerline mark on the head, the putter head becomes square to the target line and brings the golfer's eyes perpendicular over the putter and ball as they should be.~~

~~8. This alignment system can be used on different types of putter heads such as blade, mallets or heel toe weighted.~~

~~9. This alignment system can be used for left hand or right hand putters.~~

~~10. This alignment system can be used when a shaft is attached by a neck that allows for the shaft to run parallel to the face either in the back or front of the putter. The key is that the shaft has to be attached between the centerline mark and the toe.~~

ABSTRACT

A golf putter alignment system in which a putter has a center line mark and the putter shaft is joined to the putter head near the toe extending upwardly and is then angled towards the golfer. Vertical alignment of the marks on the top of the putter head and the shaft, and the golfer's eyes over the center line mark on the putter head and the mark on the upper portion of the shaft with the striking plate of the putter head square to the direction of intended travel completely aligns putter and golfer for a putt.

~~A putting system using an alignment mark on the top of a shaft in relation to the centerline mark on the putter head.~~

~~A golf putting alignment system that has a putter, which has the shaft attached to the head of the putter between the centerline mark and toe of the putter. The putter head is now closer to the golfer making it easier for the golfer to get over a putt. The shaft is at an acute angle to the heel position and extends directly over the length of putter head in direction away from the toe. Attaching the shaft in this position causes the shaft to extend back over putter head, thus crossing the centerline mark on the head. An alignment mark is placed on the shaft directly over the position the shaft crosses the centerline mark. The golfer lines the putter's face square to the desire path the ball is to travel. The golfer then aligns the alignment mark on the shaft to the centerline mark on the head, the putter head~~

~~becomes square to the target line and brings the golfer's eyes
perpendicular over the putt as it should be.~~